

Report of the panel of the review of the  
Institutional Evaluation Programme of the  
European University Association

April 2009

## 1 Executive summary

This report addresses the level of compliance of the Institutional Evaluation Programme of the European University Association (EUA-IEP, IEP) with the ENQA European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (Part 3) and with the ENQA criteria for membership. It is based on a review process initiated by ENQA at the request of the IEP. The review included a self-evaluation by IEP and a site visit undertaken by an external review panel on 16-17 February 2009.

The IEP is a quasi-independent body within the EUA. Through the EUA, the IEP is directly involved with the development of policy and strategy for quality assurance and quality culture in Europe. It works with higher education institutions, predominantly European, to provide institutional evaluations. IEP has a significant history and strong record of carrying out evaluations. IEP evaluations are primarily concerned with providing advice on the strategic management of the institutions and are broad based and flexible in approach. IEP works with established and clearly defined external quality assurance processes which include the main stages and processes recommended as good practice by the ESG, and which will take into account internal quality assurance as determined by the agreed form of the evaluation. External evaluations are conducted by IEP in accordance with clear, transparent, and publicly available procedures. The IEP draws mainly on the resources of its experts, and maintains a small administrative team, also being supported by the resources of its parent body, the EUA. IEP has carried out regular analysis of its activities with a view to enhancement and development and ongoing review is undertaken by a formally constituted Steering Committee. For IEP expert reviewers and panels, the quality of information, training and development is high. The review panel found substantial evidence that the IEP was providing a valuable and supportive service for the universities that it had evaluated. The panel also found that IEP met fully many of the standards of the ESG; where it was not fully compliant, this was a consequence of the design, aims, and inherent constraints resulting from its approach to evaluation.

The review panel considered carefully a range of documentary and oral evidence on the basis of which it concluded that the IEP, while not fully compliant with the criteria, is sufficiently compliant with both the ESG Standards and Guidelines and the ENQA membership criteria, for full membership to be recommended.

The panel has made a number of recommendations which IEP should consider as it works to become more fully compliant with the ENQA membership criteria. The panel has also offered a number of suggestions which it believes will assist in strengthening the IEP evaluation process.

The review panel has concluded that Institutional Evaluation Programme is sufficiently compliant to justify full membership of ENQA, for a period of five years.

## 2 Introduction

This is the report of the review of the Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP, the Programme) of the European University Association (EUA) undertaken in February 2009 for the purpose of determining whether the programme meets the criteria for Full membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). The criteria are listed in Annex 1 to the report.

### 2.1 Background and outline of the review process

ENQA's regulations require all Full member agencies to undergo an external cyclical review, at least once every five years, in order to verify that they fulfil the membership criteria.

In November 2004, the General Assembly of ENQA agreed that the third part of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG) should be incorporated into the membership provisions of its regulations. Substantial compliance with the ESG thus became the principal criterion for Full membership of ENQA. The ESG were subsequently adopted at the Bergen ministerial meeting of the Bologna Process in 2005.

The third part of the ESG covers the cyclical external review of quality assurance and accreditation agencies. In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, external cyclical reviews for ENQA membership purposes are normally conducted on a national level and initiated by national authorities in a EHEA State, but carried out independently from them. However, external reviews can also be coordinated by ENQA if they cannot be nationally organised. This may be the case, for instance, when no suitable or willing national body can be found to coordinate the review. In that event, ENQA plays an active role in the organisation of the review, being directly involved as coordinator, whereas, in the case of national reviews, it is only kept informed of progress throughout the whole process.

The ENQA-coordinated review of the Institutional Evaluation Programme was conducted in line with the process described in *Guidelines for national reviews of ENQA member agencies* and in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. The Review Panel for the external review of IEP was composed of the following members:

Jon Haakstad, former Rector, Assistant Director, NOKUT, Norway (Chair)  
Peter Findlay, Assistant Director, QAA, UK (Secretary)  
Steven Crow, President (retired), Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, United States  
Patricia Georgieva, Senior Expert on Quality Assurance in Higher Education, WYG International  
Predrag Lazetic, postgraduate student at the University of Kassel (Germany), Serbia

It should be made clear that this review was concerned solely with the work of the IEP and not with any part of the wider activities of the EUA.

The IEP produced a self-evaluation report, together with an Annex, which together provided a substantial portion of the evidence that the panel used to form its conclusions. The report was developed by a task group and approved by the Steering Committee of IEP. The self-evaluation report was modelled on the approach of an institutional self-evaluation document prepared for IEP itself, using the 'four questions' (see below) as a framework, and also providing a SWOT analysis of the work of IEP and its relationship to wider developments in the European quality assurance arena. Very helpfully, the self-evaluation report also provided a discussion of the extent to which, in its own assessment, the IEP currently adhered to each of the ESG standards. The Review Panel appreciated the genuine commitment to evaluation which was evident in the writing of the self evaluation report.

The panel conducted a site-visit to validate fully the self-evaluation and clarify any points at issue. On the site visit, the panel met with IEP and other EUA staff, and with members of the Steering Committee and the member of the EUA Board who represents it as an observer on the Steering Committee. It was able to conduct phone conference interviews with members of the expert pool and with staff and students in institutions that had experience of IEP evaluation. In the course of its work during the visit, the panel carefully considered the level of compliance with each of the individual ESG criteria. The panel much appreciated the readiness of IEP to make the necessary arrangements for the interviews, and the ready response to requests for additional information and documentation.

Finally, the Review Panel produced the present final report on the basis of the self-evaluation report, site-visit and its findings. In doing so it provided an opportunity for IEP to comment on the factual accuracy of the draft report. The Review Panel confirms that it was given access to all documents and people it wished to consult throughout the review.

## **2.2 Background to the Institutional Evaluation Programme**

### *History and key characteristics*

A brief outline of the European University Association (EUA) is relevant. The EUA represents and supports more than 800 institutions of higher education in 46 countries, providing them with a forum for cooperation and exchange of information on higher education and research policies. Members of the Association are European universities involved in teaching and research, national associations of rectors and other organisations active in higher education and research.

Founded in 2001 with its seat in Brussels, the EUA can best be understood in the context of this report as the 'umbrella organisation' of the IEP. The EUA is a member of the 'E4' group of organisations closely associated with the implementation of those aspects of the Bologna programme related to quality assurance in higher education in Europe, and it has a significant history in contributing to the development of

quality assurance and quality culture in the European context. This includes its status as a founder member of ENQA and a contributor to the development of the *Standards and Guidelines* (ESG).

The IEP has its origins in an initiative of the CRE (Association of European Universities) in 1994. CRE, the predecessor of EUA, launched the IEP as a programme for its member institutions. The self evaluation report explained that this development was specifically designed to demonstrate that: universities could regulate themselves, and that the model for self-regulation was peer review. The IEP evaluations also aimed to serve as a suitable institutional preparation for the national regulatory schemes which were emerging at that time.

The IEP therefore began its history as a peer review service for mutual support between European universities. The expert peers were themselves heads of institutions, and the reports were confidential. The focus of the IEP review was primarily concerned with high level institutional management, in particular strategic planning and the management of change. These features of the methodology have developed over time, but several of the original defining characteristics remain in place. It follows that the IEP does not regard itself as having the functions of a quality assurance agency in the usual sense: its work is more advisory than judgemental; it has no powers to enforce compliance; its emphasis is more broadly upon quality management at the institutional level than upon the details of quality assurance and control; it seeks to meet the needs of each individual institution on its own terms rather than to evaluate narrowly against a set framework. In all these ways the work of the IEP places a greater emphasis on quality enhancement, and this distinguishes it from a more typical quality assurance agency or authority.

The IEP has an impressive level of international activity in the evaluation of European higher education institutions. Between 1994 and 2008, it has carried out 220 evaluations in 191 institutions in 40 countries. It has evaluated institutions in 24 of the 27 EU members states, and more recently has worked outside Europe

#### *Governance and management*

IEP is governed by a Steering Committee, whose members are drawn from its expert pool, and appointed by the EUA Board for a period of four years. Criteria for appointment include relevant level of experience, geographical and gender balance, and representing the various member constituencies of the pool. The Steering Committee meets twice each year. An EUA Board member is an ex-officio member of the Steering Committee, with a view to maintaining good liaison and communication; this member abstains from discussion of operational aspects of IEP or of any specific evaluation report.

The day to day management of the service and communication with its experts is carried out by the IEP office staff, whose role is to support the Steering Committee, the evaluation teams, the institutions and the expert pool. The IEP office has three staff, and is led by the Deputy Secretary-

General of EUA. The office draws on the time of these EUA staff, whose main designated responsibilities are for the management and administration of IEP.

### *IEP evaluation method*

The IEP works through institutional evaluation. Evaluation can be understood as giving an informed expert opinion on the work of an institution, without making any formal judgement. IEP does not offer any form of accreditation, certification, or recognition. An evaluation normally involves working with an individual higher education institution within an agreed contractual commission, initiated by the Rector or head of institution. IEP also conducts from time to time 'coordinated evaluations', in which all universities or a sample of institutions in a country are evaluated, and individual evaluations and reports are coordinated by the Programme's experts, sometimes with the production of a summative overview report. These coordinated evaluations are normally commissioned by governments or government agencies, in agreement with the rectors' conference.

The evaluation methodology used is described by IEP as 'an improvement orientated, supportive evaluation that serves as a tool for strategic institutional development'. The 'fit for purpose' character of the evaluation, and its careful regard for institutional autonomy, are also underlined: [IEP] 'evaluates in the context of the mission and quality standards of each institution. As a result it does not impose standards and criteria externally, but takes as its starting point the standards and criteria of each institution in the context of its specific mission and objectives'. As a general rule, evaluations will cover the main management dimensions of an institution (teaching, research, administration, staffing, finance). Institutions may also request an evaluation of a 'special focus' which is more limited in scope. This selective focus may also hold true for coordinated evaluations, where IEP has reviewed the management of research in all national universities, or the operation of quality assurance systems across a national system. Such flexibility of approach means that IEP can address specific institutional and sectoral needs, but it also has implications with regard to the consistency and predictability of operation.

The IEP evaluation procedure is well established. It involves: an introductory workshop for the institution; an institutional self evaluation stage, producing a self evaluation report; two site visits by a panel of experts (eight days in total); a written evaluation report; an optional follow-up process. The Review Panel noted in particular the care and thoroughness of this process in terms of the time spent by the evaluation team with the institution.

The various stages in the evaluation are centred upon four key questions: what is the institution trying to do? How is it trying to do it? How does it know it works? How does the institution change in order to improve? In the view of IEP, these four questions have a proven value as a basis for institutional reflection and for the evaluative approach in peer review. It is the third of these questions – how does it know it works? - which is

most strongly concerned with quality assurance and quality management, and which will therefore bring into play the European Standards and Guidelines, and in this part of its enquiry the IEP evaluation can give attention to quality monitoring systems. It should be noted at this point, however, that the Review Panel was considerably occupied by the question of whether the ESG were sufficiently incorporated into IEP evaluations. The statements to the panel made by IEP were explicit regarding the broad strategic thrust of the IEP evaluation method, and that its primary concern was not only with quality assurance: 'we aren't evaluating quality assurance – IEP does something else'.

### *The pool of experts*

The IEP carries out evaluations by drawing upon its pool of experts. Pool members are selected by the Steering Committee, usually on nomination by other members. The majority of IEP experts have experience at the highest management level of institutions and must be current or former rectors or vice-rectors; these are the 'regular members' of the expert pool. The pool also includes student members and panel secretaries. The latter, mostly experienced higher education administrators, play a crucial role in IEP's work as they have the responsibility for managing the whole evaluation process, including liaison with institutions and the production of reports. The panel secretaries receive a fee for their contribution. The expert pool is supported by detailed written guidance on the methodology, a formal induction, regular communication, and by an annual three-day seminar.

### *Recent developments*

The IEP reviews its activities through the Steering Committee and the annual seminars, and develops its methodology on this basis. The most recently introduced initiatives have been:

- the inclusion of student members as full members of evaluation teams
- the development and publication of an Internal Quality Policy
- a decision to publish IEP evaluation reports
- 

## **2.3 Context of the review**

The review is concerned with the renewal of IEP Full membership of ENQA, which dates from 2000. The panel understands that IEP wishes to join the European Register of Quality Assurance Agencies.

## **2.4 Report structure**

The first section of this report is the executive summary.

This second section provides, firstly, an account of the review process and, secondly, a brief description of IEP and its evaluation methodology.

The third section presents the detailed findings of the Review Panel regarding the compliance of IEP with the criteria of the European Standards and Guidelines as they relate to external quality assurance.

The fourth section gives the panel's conclusion.

The report includes three annexes:

ANNEX 1: ESG (part 2 and part 3);

ANNEX 2: Terms of reference for the external review of IEP;

ANNEX 3: Glossary of acronyms.

### **3 Findings**

#### **3.1 ESG 3.1 (and section 2)/ENQA criterion 1: Use of external QA procedures**

The criterion refers to Part 2 of the ESG, which itself includes, as its first standard, reference to Part 1. The panel understands this to mean that external agencies should concern themselves in their work with the institutional implementation of the standards and guidelines contained in Part 1 of the ESG.

The expectations of the ESG under Part 2 are now considered.

[ESG 2.1] *External quality assurance*

The IEP publishes clear and helpful guidelines for use by institutions, which explain its evaluation method and approach, and advise on preparation. The guidance given to institutions and evaluation teams includes a checklist based on the ESG. The Review Panel read these guidelines, and also examined examples of self-assessment reports prepared by institutions, together with evaluation reports produced by IEP panels. The panel was able to discuss the character and aims of IEP evaluation with members of the Steering Committee, with IEP experts who had taken part in evaluations, and with representatives of universities that had participated in the process.

From this evidence, the panel formed the view that historically the IEP evaluation had been primarily concerned with broad strategic management in institutions. This meant that the attention given to the implementation of quality assurance activity (and thus to the expectations of Part 1 of the ESG) was limited, and in any case this could not necessarily be expected prior to the publication of the ESG (in 2005). But the panel found that IEP reports from after that date also only give partial attention to quality assurance as a dimension of institutional management. Very few reports seen by the panel focused strongly on detailed aspects of quality assurance, although a number were concerned with the use of quality and performance-related information in institutional quality management. The Review Panel did note that the most recent IEP reports were giving greater attention to aspects of the ESG, occasionally making an explicit reference. But in these reports the



relevant discussion remained general and often brief. It was suggested to the panel that the reports did not necessarily reflect the full amount of attention that would be given to quality assurance aspects in a panel visit, and that this would often be implicit; but this view was not well supported by the panel's discussion with institutional representatives or by pool experts.

The IEP *Guidelines for Participating Institutions* (2008) includes a section about the internal quality processes of institutions, and this makes explicit reference to the ESG. The *Guidelines to Evaluation Teams* (2008) defines evaluation process, the lines of enquiry and the general structure of an evaluation report. There is very little reference to either the ESG or to quality assurance in this second document, and the emphasis is much more on strategy and the management of change (although the panel recognises that quality assurance may well be a part of both of these). The panel learned that the intention of IEP was to make stronger and more explicit reference to quality management and to the ESG in its processes in future evaluations.

The panel also noted the full and informative report, and the very positive feedback from the commissioning agency, on the IEP coordinated review of quality assurance implementation in Irish universities. This was an example of an evaluation completely focused on the fulfilment of the ESG, which demonstrated the capacity of IEP to address this objective very successfully, when commissioned to do so. Nevertheless this was only one example, and in itself it highlighted the potential for variety and tailoring for purpose offered by IEP evaluations.

The overall conclusion of panel was that, on the basis of the evidence available, a detailed examination of the internal effectiveness of quality assurance processes had not hitherto been a central concern of IEP evaluation. Therefore IEP evaluations could not be considered to follow fully the standard at ESG 2.1., since these evaluations did not normally give sufficient attention to the quality assurance processes detailed in Part 1 of the ESG.

#### [ESG 2.2] *Development of processes*

The IEP has designed its evaluation method through consultation with institutions and through review within its Steering Committee, which consists of IEP experts who come from institutions. The method is based on the aim 'to support participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture'. The evaluation method and procedures are published in the IEP guidelines, publicly available. The guidelines are broad and process based, and the precise aims and objectives of each evaluation will be defined by the participating institution, or commissioning agency. This stage would necessarily include an assessment of impact.

The panel concluded that IEP met the expectations of the standard.

#### [ESG 2.3] *Criteria for decisions*

With regard to this standard, the IEP self-evaluation report stated: 'Evaluations are mission-driven. Therefore, the standards and criteria to assess quality levels are determined in the context of each institution's mission and objectives. IEP does not apply externally-defined standards and criteria but imposes a range of reference points and questions'. It is the case that the evaluations carried out by IEP are based upon enquiry and dialogue rather than inspection and compliance-monitoring. Reports offer advice and recommendation rather than judgements and decisions, and IEP has no authority or power which could inform a judgement or require compliance from an institution. Nevertheless, the panel observed that the IEP guidelines, and the checklist offered to institutions, do implicitly contain criteria. The 'four questions' can be considered as containing broad management criteria; the ESG are used as a reference point in the checklist.

IEP meets the remaining expectations of the ESG guideline: the recommendations are based on a published report as supporting evidence; the Review Panel chair has final responsibility for the report and may moderate it; a minimum level of consistency is achieved by having a stable pool of experts that undergoes training on an annual basis, and by establishing teams with a view to ensuring shared expertise.

The panel considered that IEP broadly met the expectations of the standard.

#### [2.4] *Processes fit for purpose*

IEP's evaluation method (outlined in Section 2.2 above) addresses in every way the ESG standard and guideline. In particular, it is strongly international, students are fully included, reports are generally comprehensive and evidence based, and the evaluations are very strongly oriented towards improvement and enhancement (a particular strength)

The panel considered that IEP met the expectations of the standard.

#### [2.5] *Reporting*

The examples of reports seen by the panel were generally thorough and clear. Reports contain clearly expressed advice to the institution. IEP evaluation reports are intended primarily for the institution, and may include its staff and students (an oral report is given at the end of the second institutional visit to a representative group). All reports are language-checked. Currently reports are not published by IEP, although the panel was told that many of them are published by the institutions concerned, and the reports have been available upon request. It is IEP's stated intention, by decision of the Steering Committee, to publish reports on its website from 2008-2009 (although none were yet published in this way at the time of this report, since the evaluations were not yet completed).

The panel considered that IEP met the expectations of the standard, with the exception of the matter of report publication, which has now been addressed.

#### [2.6] *Follow-up procedures*

By the nature of its status and its approach to evaluation, IEP has no formal authority to require institutions to develop and submit an action plan following the receipt of the evaluation reports (oral and written), or to carry out a follow-up evaluation. However, IEP strongly encourages institutions to do so. It offers the possibility of such an evaluation after a period of two to four years. It also invites all evaluated institutions to participate in a bi-annual institutional alumni forum which explores general issues emerging from evaluations. Where institutions had decided to take part in a follow-up evaluation, the panel were able to read a number of follow-up reports prepared by evaluation teams, and these were full and helpful, and recognised developments made since the original evaluation.

However, the Review Panel noted that such an involvement in follow-up was voluntary, at the discretion of the institution concerned, and subject to additional costs. While the panel were able to see examples of follow-up activity carried out by IEP, it noted that this was the exception rather than the rule. IEP itself recognises that 'in keeping with the voluntary nature of the programme, the follow-up evaluation is taken at the discretion of the institution'.

The panel considered that IEP only partially met the expectations of the standard; however it also acknowledged that the IEP offered and provided follow-up evaluation, while its voluntary nature prevents full compliance.

#### [2.7] *Periodic reviews*

The commentary of IEP with regard to this standard was clear: 'The standard does not apply since this is a voluntary programme'. As institutions will commission an IEP evaluation for a specific purpose, usually advice on strategic management, a request for a repetition of the evaluation is unlikely. As noted above, a follow-up to the original evaluation may sometimes take place. The panel also noted the suggestion in the self evaluation report that IEP evaluations could well be seen as valuably contributing to the institutional preparation for periodic external quality assurance carried out by national agencies.

As there is no suggestion that IEP reviews could or should ever be cyclical in nature, the panel concluded that the programme was not in a position to meet the expectations of this standard.

#### [2.8] *System-wide analysis*

The IEP can be viewed as fulfilling the expectations of this standard in two ways.

In its coordinated evaluations it draws together evidence from a range of institutional evaluations to produce an overview report regarding common themes and messages, and system-based analysis.

The IEP has also organised two analyses of its evaluation reports by external consultants, the most recent being review of 60 reports carried out in 2005. The analysis was focused primarily on the effectiveness of the reports themselves, but included a drawing out of common institutional themes. The programme is currently commissioning a research institute to conduct a study of more recent reports with a view to assessing the strategic response of institutions to the current economic and political context of higher education.

The Review Panel saw the synthesis report of a coordinated evaluation and the 2005 analysis of IEP reports. It judged these to be entirely in accord with the spirit of the ESG standard, and therefore considered that IEP meets the expectations of the ESG in this respect.

### *Summary*

The overall assessment by the Review Panel of this membership criterion therefore resulted in a mixed picture, which contained both strengths and weaknesses. With regard to ESG section 2, the evidence showed that IEP had strong features to demonstrate with regard to some of the standards. But it was unable, by virtue of its formal position and the very nature and design of its work rather than through any neglect, to fulfil others. Perhaps most importantly the evidence suggested to the Review Panel that IEP does not currently fully meet the expectations of the ESG 2.1 (referring to ESG Part 1) for external quality assurance. The panel wished to bear in mind, in making its judgement on this point, that adherence to the ESG is advisory both to institutions and to agencies.

### **The panel judged that IEP was substantially compliant**

#### **3.2 ESG 3.2/ENQA criterion 2: Official status**

The European University Association is legally incorporated, with its established legal base under Belgian law. The IEP is a member service of EUA with a high level of independent operation. The IEP is led by a Steering Committee responsible for all the operations of the programme, and has administrative office staff specifically responsible for the support of its work.

The self-evaluation report argued that IEP has in effect been accorded formal recognition 'by competent public authorities' (ESG) in a number of European countries through the signature of contracts with national ministries of education and other public bodies. These have included Finland (with IEP reports recognised through publication by FINHEEC), Greece, Ireland, Catalonia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Portugal).

The Review Panel was able to discuss these contracts, and spoke to one representative of a national authority, and so confirmed the standing in which IEP was held. Members had no doubt that IEP was recognised and

respected by national bodies, although this recognition was by way of a business contract rather than an assignment of formal authority. The panel nevertheless considered that this was a credible form of recognition, attributable to IEP's long and strong record in carrying out institutional evaluation.

### **The panel judged that the IEP was fully compliant**

#### **3.3 ESG 3.3/ENQA criterion 1: Activities**

IEP's core function is to carry out of institutional evaluations, and this is its sole activity. Evaluations are carried out by IEP on a regular basis at the rate of 15-20 evaluations each year. These are commissioned by individual institutions or by national bodies. As already noted, IEP evaluations are most usually concerned with advising institutions on aspects of broad strategic management across an institution; by arrangement they may focus more closely on specific aspects of higher education, such as research or quality assurance. The starting point for an IEP evaluation is based firmly on the institutions' self-evaluations of their own processes. The IEP self-evaluation report stated that its evaluations would examine 'the relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision making and strategic planning as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms'. The panel noted that some of the guidance to institutions and panels took the ESG into account as a reference points for evaluations. The panel concluded that the character and design of IEP evaluation activities was fully in accordance with this criterion.

### **The panel judged that the IEP was fully compliant**

#### **3.4 ESG 3.4/ENQA criterion 3: Resources**

IEP understands itself as a service which meets a need. Its financial and resource basis is that of being self funding: the charges that it makes to institutions for the evaluations it carries out support its staffing, administrative and other expenses, including expenses of the evaluation teams, the meetings of the Steering Committee and annual seminars. The evaluation team members are not paid for their contribution. The management of evaluations is carried out by the review secretary who is paid a fee for this work.

The main expense is the maintenance of the IEP office. This is a part of the EUA offices in Brussels, so that there are shared facilities. Staff resources are also shared as necessary to ensure efficiency of operation, so that IEP draws upon the financial management and human resources support of EUA .

The Review Panel understood that the financial management of IEP within EUA activities was not only self-funding but self-limiting. This in the sense that sufficient evaluations had to be undertaken to provide funds to support the operation, but the number of evaluations also had to be kept within the capacity of the administrative staff and the expert pool to

deliver them. On this basis, the evaluations undertaken number between 15 and 20 each year.

The Review Panel discussed the financial and resource position of the IEP with the staff of the IEP office, and with the Secretary General of EUA. The panel were also able to see and discuss the IEP accounts with the EUA Director of Finance. The panel were satisfied that IEP has a stable financial basis for its operations.

### **The panel judged that the IEP was fully compliant**

#### **3.4 ESG 3.5/ENQA Criterion 4: Mission statement**

In 2007, the IEP adopted a full statement of its mission statement, building on previous policies and guidelines, and this is published on its website.

The mission statement describes clearly the aims and principles of IEP evaluation, and it is clear that evaluation is the single activity of the Programme. The statement makes explicit reference to the ESG.

The Steering Committee of IEP is responsible for approving, reviewing and ensuring the realisation of the mission statement, and is in practice the main decision making body in relation to policy and planning. In view of the fact that the IEP evaluation method is an established and well proven methodology, and that this is the only business of IEP, the Review Panel did not consider it realistic to expect any elaborate policy and management plan flowing from the mission statement. Insofar as such policy is documented, it lies in the guidelines developed and agreed by the Steering Committee.

### **The panel judged that the IEP was fully compliant**

#### **3.5 ESG 3.6/ENQA Criterion 5/ Independence**

The self-evaluation report described IEP as 'an independently managed membership service that works with its own governance structure within the overall legal framework provided by EUA', working 'in line with the mission of the association to strengthen Europe's universities'. At various points throughout the review discussions, the panel heard IEP described both as a 'service to members' offered by EUA and as a more independent body serving universities. The IEP explained further how the appropriate balance between these two commitments had been achieved by developments in the role of IEP over time. An important decision had been taken in 2005 to define the boundaries between IEP and the governance of EUA, through a formal recorded mandate. The mandate defines the independence of the IEP Steering Committee from the EUA Board and establishes clearly the roles of each and the relationship between them. Most importantly, the mandate confirms that IEP is led by its independent Steering Committee which 'works independently from the EUA Board and has full responsibility for the development, operation, and monitoring of the programme'.

The panel pursued its enquiries relating to this criterion through an examination of the minutes of the Steering Committee, and through discussions with the General Secretary of EUA, the EUA Board representative on the IEP Steering Committee, the three members of staff of the IEP. It was able to discuss the level of independence of IEP with representatives of universities and with members of the expert pool some of whom were members of the Steering Committee. It also considered the financial and human resources arrangements governing the organisation and management of IEP.

The panel considered that it needed to reach a judgement on this criterion in two dimensions: firstly the independence of IEP from any external political involvement in its work and judgements (which the panel understood to be the main concern of ENQA in this context), and secondly the position of IEP in relation to the wider work of the EUA as its parent body.

With regard to the first, the conclusion of the panel was straightforward. IEP is an agency which acts with complete independence from governments, higher education institutions, or other external influences. Because it is a private charitable foundation, its independence is indeed substantially more clearly defined than that of many national quality assurance agencies. Further protection in the respect is provided by the *IEP Guidelines for Commissioned Work*, a policy which sets out the principles governing the acceptance of work from any party, and affirms that IEP will always select the experts for its panels, and be guided by its own key principles rather than the priorities or norms of any external commission. The panel found from the evidence that in its established processes of appointing experts, producing reports and reaching judgements, the IEP was entirely independent of outside influence, and also of any direct involvement by other parts of the EUA.

The second question – concerning the relationship with EUA - is a more complex one, while also less weighty in the considerations of the panel. It was clear to the Review Panel that IEP is very closely associated with the EUA in a number of ways: EUA is the employer of IEP staff (indeed the executive manager of the IEP programme is also the Deputy Secretary General of the EUA), there are shared offices, IEP has a budget line in EUA's accounts, and it draws on the resources of EUA colleagues for support in budgetary and human resource functions. In discussion with the panel, there appeared to be a slight difference in perspective as between EUA officers – who regarded IEP as a relatively independent branch of the EUA organisation, and IEP staff, who wished to give greater emphasis the independent management of the programme. This latter view was strongly argued by the members of the Steering Committee. Discussions with those members and examination of the minutes of the Steering Committee fully confirmed the importance of that committee in decision-making within IEP. The panel were therefore persuaded that the committee had an important role in the governance of IEP, and that it was solely responsible for decisions on IEP policy. The EUA has a non-voting observer member on the committee. In these ways, the committee can

be seen as a guarantee of a level of independence for IEP in its work within EUA.

A further consideration with regard to the independence of evaluative judgements in the IEP process is that the evaluation reports are produced by and fully 'owned' by the evaluation team. In that sense IEP evaluations are a pure form of peer review, without the involvement of any overarching agency.

In the view of the panel, the IEP is fully independent of higher education institutions and governments and is sufficiently autonomous in defining its procedures and methods and in reaching judgements.

### **The panel judged that IEP was fully compliant**

#### **3.6 ESG 3.7/ENQA Criterion 6 & 8: External quality assurance criteria and processes**

The IEP self-evaluation report confirmed that: 'evaluations are based on a self-evaluation report, two site visits, an oral and written report. The evaluation process is presented in the programme guidelines, which are publicly available...institutions are strongly urged to undertake follow-up activities'.

The Review Panel discussed the evaluation process with review chairs, review secretaries, student panel members and other members of the IEP expert pool. It also spoke to groups of institutional representatives concerning their direct experience of the process. The Review Panel read the programme guidelines and checked that these are publicly available, and members also read copies of evaluation reports on institutions. On the basis of this work, the Review Panel was able to confirm that the IEP process operates as described above by the self-evaluation report.

The points contained within this criterion relating to agreed criteria, nature of reports, and follow-up procedures are discussed in some detail at 3.1 above, in the context of the panel's consideration of the ESG Part 2. It should again be remarked here that the IEP process, because of its inherent principles, design and operation, does not use a standard set of criteria. While it offers and encourages a follow-up procedure, this cannot be mandatory.

With regard to criteria, it should be additionally mentioned at this point that the Review Panel considered that the positive features of the IEP approach which allow flexibility and variety in its evaluation process are likely at the same time to make it more difficult to guarantee consistency and comparability. As evidence of this, the panel found very considerable variation between reports that it read, and while some had the structure of the 'four questions' of evaluation as a guiding format, other reports did not address these in any systematic way. Overall the panel concluded that the IEP process could not be viewed as one systematically shaped by a common set of criteria.



An area where IEP has introduced a major enhancement to its process is the inclusion of student members on its evaluation panels. The Review Panel considered that this change had been addressed in a very positive manner. A number of pilot evaluations were conducted and reviewed. The Steering Committee then agreed to the inclusion of student members as a standard procedure. Role specification for student members and recruitment of student panel members then followed, supported by training. Students are full members of both the evaluation panels and the expert pool, and participate in the annual training seminars for the pool. The panel was able to follow these developments in documentation, and spoke to student panel members regarding their participation. The panel would commend the IEP on the way in which has introduced student members into its process.

The Review Panel read a representative sample of IEP evaluation reports and also a number of follow-up reports. Although the reports have different structure and length, and discuss different issues in each case, they follow a common pattern:

- a starting point of the review is a **situational analysis**, which is then followed by the **analysis of gaps** and the recommendations are formulated against those gaps identified.
- The focus of the review is the institutional management and capacity for change. The effectiveness of institutional structure is often included within the focus of the review, especially where the situational analysis reveals that structural ineffectiveness is a major obstacle to reform and to capacity for change.
- The purpose and function of the institutional review process, as well as the follow-up is **consultative** for the institution. No sanctions are envisaged for the reviewed institution if it does not follow the recommendations made, nor has it been obliged to publish the IEP external review reports (although this will change with the new policy regarding publication). Not surprisingly, follow-up reports seen by the Review Panel sometimes had to deal with the same issues as in the original report and to make similar recommendations.

Finally, with regard to appeals, IEP is clearly not 'an agency that makes formal quality assurance decisions, or conclusions which have formal consequences' and therefore it has no appeals procedure in place. It does, however, have a complaints procedure which may be invoked by an institution if it considers that an evaluation has not been carried out in accordance with IEP Guidelines and the Charter of Conduct for Pool Members. The Review Panel considered the complaints procedure and noted that it included the possibility for review of the evaluation process by an ad-hoc group of pool members not previously associated with the evaluation. The complaints procedure appeared to the panel to be appropriate and fair.

The Review Panel concluded that the IEP evaluation process broadly meets the expectations of this criterion, and in some respects it has notable strengths (responsiveness to institutions, two full visits, two reports, student membership). But in other areas it does not yet fully meet the criterion (publication of a report, follow-up procedures).

**The panel judged that the IEP was substantially compliant**

### **3.7 ESG 3.8/ENQA Criterion 7: Accountability procedures**

The IEP self evaluation report pointed to a range of measures which were considered by IEP to fulfil the requirements of this criterion. It should be noted that IEP does not use sub-contractors so this aspect of the criterion does not apply.

The Review Panel were able to gain an understanding of the measure used for internal quality assurance through discussion with IEP staff and with institutional representatives, by reading of the Steering Committee minutes and by reference to the IEP documentation provided.

The Review Panel established the following with reference to the subsections of the criterion:

- i) IEP has in place an Internal Quality Policy, resulting from discussions in held by the Steering Committee and expert pool review Chairs, and subsequently at the annual seminar in 2007. The policy was published in 2008 and is available through the IEP website.
- ii) To assure the quality of IEP evaluations, the Internal Quality Policy lays down procedural guidance relating to the appointment, induction, and review of pool members; it sets out rules for the composition of evaluation teams. The Policy is supplemented by two more detailed Annexes: Guidelines for Commissioned Work, which establishes principles and conditions for the commissioning of an evaluation; and a Code of Conduct for Pool Members, which relates to the procedures and behaviour in carrying out of reviews, including in particular confidentiality and also addresses the avoidance of any conflict of interest.

The Internal Quality Policy lays out the measures for gaining feedback and reflection on IEP evaluations. Feedback is sought on each review, through questionnaires, from institutions and from the evaluation team. The Review Panel saw examples of completed questionnaires. It was clear that the Steering Committee and the annual seminar reviewed the effectiveness of evaluations on a regular basis, but the Review Panel did not see systematic report to those bodies which provided an analysis of the feedback evaluation.

- iii) With regard to mandatory cyclical external review, IEP was able to demonstrate that it had carried out a number of reviews of its procedures. In total seven evaluations of the IEP had been carried out between 1995 and 2005, relating variously to the early monitoring of evaluations, two evaluative reviews of IEP reports, and a full review of the IEP by an external panel carried out in 2003.

The ENQA Review Panel considered that the evidence of these evaluations of the programme clearly constituted a regular pattern of self-review and a readiness to obtain information about the

effectiveness and impact of IEP evaluations and in particular the reports. However, these activities were not part of a formally agreed cyclical pattern of review on a periodic basis and, apart from the 2003 review, had the character of ad hoc commissioned evaluations. IEP has since addressed this matter, again within its Internal Quality Policy, by making an explicit commitment to an external review every five years, starting with the current ENQA membership review and including a report on conformity to the membership criteria.

Further aspects of self reflection and evaluation within IEP take place through the meetings of the Steering Committee, which regularly considers the effectiveness of evaluations judged from reports, can comment on consistency, and has an overview of how the programme relates to wider developments in European quality assurance. Reflection is also inherent in the staff appraisal processes for the staff of the IEP Office. These staff regularly review their work in support of the programme, in monthly meetings, but understandably these discussions were relatively informal and records were not kept.

An important source of evaluative reflection is the annual three day seminar of the pool experts. The panel members were able to see examples of the programme for the seminar, and to discuss it with representatives of the pool of experts. Attendance at the seminar is very strongly expected by IEP. The seminar typically includes induction for new members of the pool; reflections on the various roles of pool members – (Chair, Student, Secretary); a review of a specific aspect of the evaluation process (for instance, interviewing institutional representatives in the course of an evaluation, or formulating recommendations); and an overview of recent policy developments in European higher education. On the basis of what it heard from expert pool members and other evidence, the Review Panel concluded that the annual seminar was an excellent vehicle for reviewing and developing the Programme and that it constituted commendable good practice.

**The panel judged that the IEP was fully compliant**

#### **4 Additional reflections**

The panel noted that the IEP self-evaluation demonstrated a clear awareness of a number of possible weaknesses in the implementation of its processes (especially in the SWOT analysis), although with regard to some of these the panel heard little concerning current plans to address them. The Review Panel reflected that it could be the case that well-founded sense of confidence based on the strong and successful history of the IEP process, combined with pressure of business, might have contributed to a reluctance to envisage or plan for change. The panel were therefore of the view that IEP would benefit from more regular systematic review of its own processes, taking into account changes in the higher education environment. Particular areas which might deserve attention are: the consistency of reports; the more formalised use of feedback from

institutions and teams; and the possibility of including in the process a standard follow-up procedure requiring less than full-scale evaluation. Such measures will serve to strengthen the Programme's existing procedures. Other recommendations from the panel listed below are made on the assumption that the IEP is committed to a pattern of development which will make it more comparable to a quality assurance agency in its role and functions. In the view of the Review Panel, it will be difficult for the IEP, as it currently operates, to fulfil this role and thus fully meet the criteria for membership of ENQA, since these are presently formulated as identical with the ESG.

The Review Panel wishes to draw the attention of the ENQA Board to the strong support from institutions for the work of the IEP, a feature that was clearly evident in the evidence reviewed. It was clear to the panel that IEP has been able to play a significant and very positive developmental role in its support to European institutions in framing their approaches to policy and management. That was particularly the case with institutions with relatively little experience of strategic management or from less well-developed parts of the EHEA. The approach taken by IEP to evaluation was very strongly welcomed by institutions presenting evidence to the Review Panel for its qualities of breadth and flexibility, and examples of added value and benefit were cited in all cases. It appeared to the panel that the method was one which encouraged and produced mutual trust between the Programme and institution. IEP is clearly achieving its aim of advising, supporting, and strengthening institutions.

The Review Panel also discussed the IEP's views on the advantages and disadvantages of its regulation of recruitment to the expert pool. The panel considered that there was a real possibility that by building a process limited to rectors and vice-rectors, and then working with many who are now retired from their full-time involvement with institutional management, IEP, despite all its training, could run the risk of becoming dated with regard to current developments. Given the rapidity of change in higher education, IEP may wish to consider broadening the pool of experts so as to reduce such a risk and to ensure that it can perform its mission equally well with institutions at the forefront of development in such areas as e-learning and employability.

Finally, the Review Panel wishes to highlight two areas where it considered that IEP's approach to external quality assurance was exemplary and commendable: the involvement of students in its processes, and the training of its expert pool through the annual three-day seminar meetings. The international character of IEP's evaluation teams is also a notable feature of its work, and brings a number of benefits to the process. The Review Panel also wishes to bring to the attention of the ENQA Board the fact that the two 'non-compliant' criteria identified in the following conclusion have overlapping requirements, and that the grounds for non-compliance are therefore partly repeated.

## **5 Conclusion**

In the light of the documentary and oral evidence considered by it, the Review Panel is of the opinion that, in the performance of its functions, the Institutional Evaluation Programme of the European Universities Association is not fully compliant with the *ENQA Membership Regulations* and the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. The Programme is, nonetheless, in the opinion of the Review Panel, sufficiently compliant to justify full membership of ENQA.

The standards/criteria where full compliance has have not been achieved are:

ESG 3.1 (and section 2)/ENQA criterion 1: Use of external QA procedures

ESG 3.7/ENQA Criterion 6 & 8: External quality assurance criteria and processes

and the Programme is recommended to take appropriate action, so far as it is empowered to do so, to achieve full compliance with these standards at the earliest opportunity.

### **Recommendations**

The Review Panel makes the following recommendations, believing that they will serve to strengthen the Programme's qualification for membership of ENQA, while at the same time further developing IEP's own aim of supporting the autonomy and effective management of institutions

The panel recommends to the IEP that it:

- strengthen further the attention given in its evaluation process to Parts 1 and 2 of the ESG
- consider how it can achieve a higher level of consistency and continuity in its evaluations and the reports produced by them; a strengthened emphasis on the ESG (see above) may provide a core that would contribute to such consistency
- introduce a more formal expectation of follow-up reporting from institutions to IEP, as a part of its process
- put into effect its stated policy that it will publish all future institutional evaluation reports
- provide for a more formal internal review of its process at suitable intervals, for instance through a written annual report discussed by the Steering Committee. As a part of such a review, to consider how it can itself learn from its involvement with institutions, and how its own processes need to change

- consider whether it would be appropriate to broaden the pool of regular experts to include appropriately qualified and experienced colleagues other than those at the level of Rector and Pro-Rector.

## **6 Annexes**

### **Annex 1: European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the Higher Education Area**

#### **Part 2**

##### **2.1 Use of internal quality assurance procedures.**

External quality assurance procedures should take in account the effectiveness of the internal assurance processes described in part 1 of the ESG.

##### **2.2 Development of external quality assurance procedures.**

The aims and objectives of quality assurance processes should be determined before the processes themselves are developed, by all those responsible (including higher education institutions) and should be published with a description of the procedures to be used.

**2.3 Criteria for decisions.** Any formal decisions made as a result of external quality assurance activity should be based on explicit criteria that are applied consistently.

**2.4 Processes fit for purpose.** All external quality assurance processes should be designed specifically to ensure their fitness to achieve the aims and objectives set for them.

**2.5 Reporting.** Reports should be published and should be written in a style, which is clear and readily accessible to its intended readership. Any decisions, commendations contained in reports should be easy for a reader to find.

**2.6 Follow-up procedures.** Quality assurance processes which contain recommendations for action or which require a subsequent action plan, should have a predetermined follow-up procedure which is implemented consistently.

**2.7 Periodic reviews.** External quality assurance of institutions and/or programmes should be undertaken on a cyclical basis. The length of the cycle and the review procedures to be used should be clearly defined and published in advance.

**2.8 System-wide analyses.** Quality assurance agencies should produce from time to time summary reports describing and analysing the general findings of their review, evaluations, assessments, etc.

## Part 3

### 3.1 Use of external quality assurance procedures for higher education.

The external quality assurance of agencies should take into account the presence and effectiveness of the external quality assurance processes described in Part 2 of the European Standards and Guidelines.

**3.2 Official status.** Agencies should be formally recognised by competent authorities in the European Higher Education Area as agencies with responsibilities for external quality assurance and should have an established legal basis. They should comply with any requirements of the legislative jurisdictions within which they operate.

**3.3 Activities.** Agencies should undertake external quality assurance activities (at institutional or programme level) on a regular basis.

**3.4 Resources.** Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their external quality assurance process(es) in an effective and efficient manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes and procedures.

**3.5 Mission statement.** Agencies should have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work, contained in a publicly available statement.

**3.6 Independence.** Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

### 3.7 External quality assurance criteria and processes used by agencies.

The processes, criteria and procedures used by the Agency should be pre-defined and publicly available. These processes will normally be expected to include a self-assessment or equivalent procedure by the subject of the quality assurance process; an external assessment by a group of experts, including, as appropriate, a student member(s) and site visits as decided by the agency; publication of a report including any decisions, recommendations or other formal outcomes; a follow-up procedure to review actions taken by the subject of the quality assurance process in the light of any recommendations contained in the report.

**3.8 Accountability procedures.** Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

## Appendix 2

External Review of the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (EUA-IEP) by  
The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

### Annex 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

3 November 2008

#### 1. Background and Context

The European University Association (EUA) represents and supports more than 800 institutions<sup>1</sup> of higher education in 46 countries, providing them with a forum for cooperation and exchange of information on higher education and research policies. Members of the Association are European universities involved in teaching and research, national associations of rectors and other organisations active in higher education and research.

The EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (EUA-IEP) was launched in 1994 as a strategic tool for change in higher education institutions. So far, 250 institutions in Europe and worldwide have participated in the Programme. The Programme is overseen by a Steering Committee.

The mission of the Institutional Evaluation Programme (EUA-IEP) is to reinforce the autonomy and strategic steering capacity of higher education institutions and to strengthen higher education systems through institutional, regional or national evaluations.

The EUA-IEP emphasises an inclusive self-evaluation process and institutional self-knowledge for improved internal governance and management as well as for external accountability purposes. The EUA-IEP reinforces internal quality processes and contributes to building the capacity of institutions to change.

#### 2

The EUA-IEP evaluates higher education institutions in the context of their specific goals and objectives and actively supports them in fulfilling their public mission by providing recommendations on their institutional structures, processes, policies and culture, enabling them to perform the full range of their activities (research, teaching and learning and service to society). In doing so, EUA-IEP evaluations take into account the most recent European and international developments in higher education and research policies.

#### 2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

This is a type A review, as defined in the Guidelines for national reviews of ENQA member agencies. The review will evaluate the way in which and to what extent the EUA-IEP fulfils the criteria for the ENQA membership and thus the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Consequently, the review will also provide information to the ENQA Board to aid its consideration of whether the EUA-IEP Full Membership in ENQA should be reconfirmed. The review panel is not expected, however, to make any judgements as regards the reconfirmation of EUA-IEP's Full Membership in ENQA.

The review will assess the EUA-IEP in relation to its mission and objectives and provide recommendations on the EUA-IEP's organisational practices, with a view towards continuous enhancement and providing optimal services to higher education institutions.

#### 3. The Review Process



The process will be designed in the light of the ENQA policy on “ENQA-organised external reviews of member agencies”.

The evaluation procedure will consist of the following steps:

- Nomination and appointment of the review team members;
- Self-evaluation by a self-evaluation committee, including the IEP Secretariat, members of the IEP Steering Committee, a rector of an institution that was evaluated and who is a member of the IEP pool, and a student;
- A site visit by the panel of reviewers to the IEP Secretariat and interviews with members of the IEP Steering Committee, a sample of IEP pool members and a sample of rectors of institutions that have been evaluated;
- Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report.

### 3.1 Nomination and appointment of the review team members

The review panel will consist of five members: four external reviewers (an overseas representative of higher education institutions, a European quality assurance expert, a European representative of higher education institutions and student member) and a review secretary. The review team will be nominated by the ENQA Board on the basis of proposals submitted to ENQA by the national agencies, and will normally be drawn from senior serving members of staff of ENQA member agencies. The nomination of the student member will be asked of the European Students' Union (ESU). The team members will have extensive European or international experience in higher education and particularly with institutional evaluations. The current members of the ENQA Board will not be eligible to serve as reviewers.

ENQA will provide to the IEP Steering Committee a list of suggested experts with their respective curricula vitae. The experts will have to sign a non-conflict of interest statement as regards the EUA-IEP review.

### 3.2 Self-evaluation by the IEP Steering Committee, including the preparation of a self-evaluation report

The IEP Steering Committee is responsible for the execution and organisation of the self-evaluation process of the EUA-IEP and shall take into account the following guidance:

- Self-evaluation is organised as a project with a clearly defined schedule and includes all relevant internal and external stakeholders;
- The self-evaluation report is broken down by the topics of the evaluation: background description of the current situation of the EUA-IEP; analysis and appraisal of the current situation; proposals for improvement and measures already planned; a summary of perceived strengths and weaknesses;
- The report will include a discussion of the history and evolution of the EUA-IEP. It will situate the EUA-IEP in the context of the changing European HE environment.
- The report is also well-structured, concise and comprehensively prepared. It clearly demonstrates the extent to which the EUA-IEP fulfils its mission and objectives and tasks of external quality assurance. The report will also demonstrate to what extent the EUA-IEP meets the criteria for ENQA membership and thus the European Standards and Guidelines. The report will be submitted to the review panel a minimum of four weeks prior to the site visit.

### 3.3 A Site Visit and interviews by the Review Panel

The review panel will draw up and publish a schedule of the site visit and interviews. The schedule will include an indicative timetable of the meetings and

other exercises to be undertaken by the review team during the site visit, the duration of which will be 2 days.

The interviews with A) members of the IEP Steering Committee and a sample of IEP pool members and B) a sample of rectors of institutions that have been evaluated, will be done in conjunction with the site visit, or if this is not possible, through distance interviews of convenient format (telephone conference, e-mail or other).

### 3.4 Preparation and completion of the final evaluation report

On the basis of the review panel's findings, the review secretary will draft the report in consultation with the expert panel. The report will take into account the purpose and scope of the evaluation as defined under article 2. It will also provide a clear rationale for its findings. A draft will be submitted for comment to the IEP Steering Committee within four weeks of the site visit for comment on factual accuracy. If the IEP Steering Committee chooses to provide a statement in reference to the draft report it will be submitted to the chairperson of the review panel within eight weeks after the receipt of the draft report. Thereafter the expert panel will take into account the statement by the IEP Steering Committee, finalise the document and submit it to the IEP Steering Committee and ENQA.

The report is to be finalised within two months of the site visit and will not exceed 40 pages in length.

### 4. Follow-up Process and Publication of the Report

The IEP Steering Committee will consider the expert panel's report and inform ENQA of its plans to implement any recommendations contained in the report. Subsequent to the discussion of the evaluation results and any planned implementation measures with ENQA, the review report and the follow-up plans agreed upon will be published on EUA-IEP's website.

### 5. Budget

5.1 EUA shall pay the following review related fees:

- Chair 5.000 EUR
- Review secretary 5.000 EUR
- Other panel members 3.000 EUR
- Administrative overhead for ENQA Secretariat 5.000 EUR
- Travel and subsistence expenses (approximate) 6.000 EUR

This gives a total indicative cost of 30.000 EUR for the review. In the case that the allowance for travel and subsistence expenses is exceeded, EUA-IEP will cover any additional costs after the completion of the review. However, the ENQA Secretariat will endeavour to keep the travel and subsistence expenses in the limits of the planned budget, and will refund to EUA-IEP the difference if the travel and subsistence costs go under budget.

### 6. Indicative Schedule of the Review

The duration of the evaluation is scheduled to take 17 months, from February 2008 to July 2009:

The IEP Steering Committee starts self-evaluation February 2008

Agreement on terms of reference and protocol for review August 2008

Appointment of review team members by ENQA August 2008

Preparation of site visit schedule and indicative timetable October 2008

EUA-IEP self-evaluation completed November 2008

6

Briefing of review team members (teleconference) December 2008

Expert panel site visit February 2009

Draft of evaluation report to the IEP Steering Committee April 2009

Statement of the IEP Steering Committee to the review team, if necessary June 2009

Submission of the final report to the IEP Steering Committee  
and to ENQA July 2009

Consideration of the report by the IEP Steering Committee October 3 2009

Consideration of the final report and response to the  
IEP Steering Committee by ENQA November 2009

Publication of report and implementation plan November 2009

### **Appendix 3**

Glossary of acronyms

EHEA European Higher Education Area

ENQA European Association of Quality Assurance Agencies

EUA European University Association

ESG European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the  
European Higher Education Area

FINHEEC [The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council](#)

IEP Institutional Evaluation Programme (of the European University  
Association)

NOKUT The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education

QAA The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, UK